I D 10

DRAFT II
Marks/bel
5/3/74

Interview with Dr. Andrew F. Stehney conducted by Marks and Miazga at 2:00 pm, 4/15/74

Dr. Andrew F. Stehney is Deputy Director of the Center for Human Radiobiology.

Dr. Stehney provided certain miscellaneous items of information of interest. He gave us Dr. Jan Lieben's address at the FMC corporation in Philadelphia and his office and residence phone numbers to permit contact to be established with Dr. Lieben in order to find out what Dr. Lieben told the survivors of deceased patients in obtaining permission for exhumation. He revealed that Dr. Wright Langham had been employed in the Chemistry Section at the Metallurgical Laboratory from about fall 1943 to the middle of 1944.

In response to a question about the time when Dr. Christine Waterhouse was contacted to obtain her cooperation in the recent studies, he said that Dr. Durbin had made the contact with Dr. Waterhouse before the Durbin files were given to Dr. Rowland in December 1972. He further said that, when the Center for Human Radiobiology took over the study, Dr. Waterhouse discouraged disclosure to the patients because she thought that the effects on these old patients would be harmful and that no good purpose would be served by it. The matter of disclosure to Rochester patients was left to Dr. Waterhouse's discretion.

In response to a question about funding of the Rochester study,

Dr. Stehney said that daily costs of hospitalization were covered by the

Center for Human Radiobiology. He implied that the funding of Rochester

activities was limited to this type of expense.

With regard to permission for exhumation of bodies Dr. Stehney's impression was that the families were told that there is residual radio-activity from treatments that were given to the deceased persons many years ago.

We inquired as to whether the patient from Texas had signed a consent form of the type used for radium and all other human subjects studied at the CHR. Dr. Stehney said that that patient had not signed a consent form and attributed this failure to the unusual way of recruiting this man for the study. He said that the patient happened to be studied at the CHR because he was reluctant to fly to Rochester where samples were to be taken and instead took a bus. The long bus trip from Texas to Rochester carried him through Chicago. Since the patient was in Chicago anyway, he was brought to Argonne for such studies as the clinical history, radiologic and laboratory examinations but was not given a physical examination at Argonne. He said that the CHR. had intended to tell the man about his plutonium deposition when they fully confirmed that this was indeed the man with the deposition. However, the amount that the man had received was relatively small and was injected into a leg that was amputated shortly thereafter. The plutonium was not demonstrated in whole body counting and the small amounts of urine that were examined originally failed to show evidence of plutonium. It was only when the analysts at CHR began to examine 24 hour samples in January or February 1974, that they conclusively demonstrated plutonium deposition in the man and, therefore, felt justified in making the disclosure to him. At the present time, they are holding up the disclosure because of the AEC's request that this action be cleared first with AEC.